



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,491	09/23/2003	Robert Sheffield	57983.000131	1242

7590 10/19/2005

Thomas E. Anderson  
Hunton & Williams LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER
----------

VAN, LUAN V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1753

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/667,491

Applicant(s)

SHEFFIELD ET AL.

Examiner

Luan V. Van

Art Unit

1753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/26/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9-23-03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1-6 in the reply filed on 9/26/05 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the method and the product are related and are not independent from each other. This is not found persuasive because the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as sputter deposition, ion milling or wet chemical etching. The Applicants have not shown why the claimed product cannot be formed by the method proposed by the examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor et al. '528.

Regarding claim 1, Taylor et al. '528 teach a method for electroplating on at least one surface of the conductive circuit trace, such as conductors 310 and 328 in figure 3.

Art Unit: 1753

The present method would improve the performance of signal transmitted trace via a conductive circuit by reducing surface roughness, since a uniform layer of metal is being deposited (example 1).

Regarding claim 2, Taylor et al. '528 teach reducing the surface roughness includes electropolishing (i.e. anodic pulses) at least one surface in which "the anodic pulses should be relatively short in order to favor removal of excess metal from the convex and peak portions of the substrate surface" (column 8 lines 63-67); and electroplating (i.e. cathodic pulses) at least one surface. In addition, Taylor et al. '528 teach "Although the anodic removal of excess metal reduces the overall efficiency of the electroplating process, the benefits of obtaining a uniform coating over the surface and the through-holes provides a benefit to the manufacturing process" (column 9 lines 8-12).

Regarding claim 6, Taylor et al. '528 teach at least one surface the conductive circuit trace includes a surface parallel and distal surface circuit board (conductor 310); and a surface perpendicular to the circuit board (conductor 328). In addition, Taylor et al. '528 teach "A uniform layer 326 of copper has been deposited over the first layer 324 and onto the inner surface 322 of the through-hole 320" (column 10 lines 49-52).

Claims 1-2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ozeki et al.

Regarding claim 1, Ozeki et al. teach a method for electroplating on at least one surface of the conductive circuit trace, such as circuit pattern 22 in figure 1. The present method would improve the performance of signal transmitted trace via a conductive circuit by reducing the surface roughness.

Regarding claim 2, Ozeki et al. teach reducing the surface roughness includes electroplating at least one surface (paragraph 52).

Regarding claim 6, Ozeki et al. teach at least one surface the conductive circuit trace includes a surface parallel and distal surface circuit board, such as circuit pattern 22 in figure 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 1753

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al. '528 in view of Nagai et al. or Taylor '231.

Taylor et al. '528 teach the method as described above in addressing claim 1. Taylor et al. '528 also teach that an appropriate plating bath including additives can be selected to improve the uniformity of the deposited coating (column 9 lines 50-60).

The difference between the reference to Taylor et al. '528 and the instant claims is that the reference does not explicitly teach the specific value of the surface roughness of the conductive trace.

Nagai et al. teach "Large surface roughness of a copper foil results in the skin effect such that the current of electric signal having 1 GHz or more of frequency locally flows only on the surface of a coil. As a result, the impedance increases and the transmission of high-frequency signals is seriously influenced. Fine surface roughness is, therefore, necessary for conductive material used in a high-frequency circuit. The present inventors examined the relationship between the surface roughness and the high-frequency performance and discovered that 2 micrometer or less of surface roughness in terms of the terms of the ten-point average surface-roughness (Rz) attains

Art Unit: 1753

the desired high-frequency performance. The fine roughness can be provided by means of producing a wrought copper foil or electro-deposited copper foil under appropriate conditions, or chemically or electrolytically polishing the surface of a copper foil" (paragraph 28).

Taylor '231 teaches a method for electropolishing a metal surface to reduce its roughness, and that a "smooth polished surface suitable for high-quality commercial product might have an Ra value defined by the end use, in the order of for example 5  $\mu$ m or less" (column 3 lines 36-43).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Taylor et al. '528 by electroplating or electropolishing a conductive trace to have a surface roughness of less than a few micrometer as taught by either Nagai et al. or Taylor '231, because it would decrease the resistivity and impedance of a high-frequency signal.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozeki et al. in view of Nagai et al. or Taylor '231.

Ozeki et al. teach the method as described above in addressing claim 1.

The difference between the reference to Ozeki et al. and the instant claims is that the reference does not explicitly teach the specific value of the surface roughness of the conductive trace.

Nagai et al. teach "Large surface roughness of a copper foil results in the skin effect such that the current of electric signal having 1 GHz or more of frequency locally flows only on the surface of a coil. As a result, the impedance increases and the transmission of high-frequency signals is seriously influenced. Fine surface roughness is, therefore, necessary for conductive material used in a high-frequency circuit. The present inventors examined the relationship between the surface roughness and the high-frequency performance and discovered that 2 micrometer or less of surface roughness in terms of the terms of the ten-point average surface-roughness (Rz) attains the desired high-frequency performance. The fine roughness can be provided by means of producing a wrought copper foil or electro-deposited copper foil under appropriate conditions, or chemically or electrolytically polishing the surface of a copper foil" (paragraph 28).

Taylor '231 teaches a method for electropolishing a metal surface to reduce its roughness, and that a "smooth polished surface suitable for high-quality commercial product might have an Ra value defined by the end use, in the order of for example 5  $\mu$ m or less" (column 3 lines 36-43).



Art Unit: 1753

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Ozeki et al. by electroplating or electropolishing a conductive trace to have a surface roughness of less than a few micrometer as taught by either Nagai et al. or Taylor '231, because it would decrease the resistivity and impedance of a high-frequency signal.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure. Taylor '144 teach a similar electropolishing technique.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luan V. Van whose telephone number is 571-272-8521. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1753

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LVV  
10/04/05



NAM NGUYEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700